

## UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Viginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gcv

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
09/816,236	03/26/2001	Masashi Isakawa	100021-00046	8733	
4372	7590 07/22/2003				
ARENT FOX KINTNER PLOTKIN & KAHN			EXAMINER		
1050 CONNI SUITE 400	ECTICUT AVENUE, N.W		CHOI, V	CHOI, WOO H	
WASHINGT	ON, DC 20036		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
			2186	370.00	
			DATE MAILED: 07/22/2003		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)				
Advisory Action	09/816,236	ASAKAWA ET AL.				
Advisory Adden	Examiner	Art Unit				
	Woo H. Choi	2186				
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ars on the cover sheet with the o	orrespondence addre	ess			
THE REPLY FILED 03 July 2003 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE. Therefore, further action by the applicant is required to avoid abandonment of this application. A proper reply to a final rejection under 37 CFR 1.113 may only be either: (1) a timely filed amendment which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee); or (3) a timely filed Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114.						
PERIOD FOR REPLY [check either a) or b)]						
<ul> <li>a)</li></ul>	Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth ater than SIX MONTHS from the mailing FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF TH	g date of the final rejection IE FINAL REJECTION.	n. See MPEP			
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 C	of extension and the corresponding amo the shortened statutory period for reply the later than three months after the mail	unt of the fee. The approoriginally set in the final C	priate extension Office action; or			
1. A Notice of Appeal was filed on Appellant's Brief must be filed within the period set forth in 37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 1.191(d)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal.						
2. The proposed amendment(s) will not be entered because:						
(a) ☐ they raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);						
(b) ☐ they raise the issue of new matter (see Note below);						
(c) ☐ they are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or						
(d) They present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.						
NOTE:						
3. Applicant's reply has overcome the following reject	ion(s):					
4. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s).						
5. ☐ The a) ☐ affidavit, b) ☐ exhibit, or c) ☐ request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: See Continuation Sheet.						
6. The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered becaraised by the Examiner in the final rejection.	ause it is not directed SOLELY t	o issues which were	newly			
7. For purposes of Appeal, the proposed amendment explanation of how the new or amended claims we	• • •		nd an			
The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:						
Claim(s) allowed:			,			
Claim(s) objected to:						
Claim(s) rejected:						
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:						
8. $\hfill \square$ The proposed drawing correction filed on is	a)☐ approved or b)☐ disapp	roved by the Examin	er.			
9. Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s)( PTO-1449) Paper No(s)						
10. Other:						
whe						

Continuation of 5. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: Applicant's allegation regarding the mode setting unit in Usami's disclosure has been addressed in the last Office Action mailed 3 February 2003, paper number 7, in the response to argument section on page 14. Fadavi-Ardekani's teaching that is combined is the plurality of controllers.

MATTHEW KIM

SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER

TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100